

29



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,409	03/26/2004	Brett Ashley Roderick	JH03-182	8915

7590 07/28/2005

John C. Andrade, Esquire
116 West Water Street
P. O. Box 598
Dover, DE 19903

EXAMINER

OKEZIE, ESTHER O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3654

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/810,409	RODERICK, BRETT ASHLEY	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Esther O. Okezie	3654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-5 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 6-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f):
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The amendment filed on 5/13/2005 and the remarks presented therewith have been carefully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1,6,10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lambson. It is noted that the applicant has set forth the subcombination of a tool for securing a bracket and but refers to the combination of a tool and a bracket. These claims are being treated as the subcombination.

2. Re claim 1, Lambson discloses a tool for placing brackets to secure a joist to a header comprising:

- (a) a tool body (1);
- (b) legs (3) rigidly connected to said body and extending upward from said body;
- (c) means for holding a bracket (7) having a heel and two upright members when inserted between said legs comprising a pedestal keel (14) extending outward from said body; and
- (d) a handle (32) extending downward from said body; and

Art Unit: 3654

(e) pedestal tongues (8,9) extending outward in the opposite direction of the pedestal keel away from said body.

3. Re claim 6, said pedestal keel and said pedestal tongues have a top and said top of said pedestal keel is offset and lower than said top of said pedestal tongue by the thickness of said heel of said bracket, depending on the size of the bracket.

4. Re claim 10, the handle (32) is ribbed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambson. Lambson does not disclose the tool constructed from plastic. Plastic tools are old and well known in the subject matter area of the invention. It would have been obvious to make the out of plastic since tools made of plastic are of lighter weight.

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambson in view of Duffy. Lambson does not disclose a utility aperture located within the handle. Duffy discloses a tool for box setting with a utility aperture in the handle (22). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the handle of Lambson to

Art Unit: 3654

include a utility aperture as taught by Duffy in order to hang the tool from a hook when not in use.

7. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambson in view of Brodeur. Lambson does not disclose the handle set at an angle from the body. Brodeur discloses a joist hanger mounting tool with handle (30) set at angle from the tool body. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the handle of Lambson to be set as taught by Brodeur at angle to the tool body in order "to promote safety of a user during joist hanger installation procedures by keeping the user's hands away from the joist hanger as the hanger is nailed to the header" (Brodeur: col. 1, lines 54-57; abstract).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as above.

Regarding the 112 rejections, these rejections have been omitted and the applicant's suggestion of adding the definition of "pedestal tongue" in the Specification as submitted is acceptable.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Esther O. Okezie whose telephone number is (571) 272-8108. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 8-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Katherine A. Matecki can be reached on (571) 272-6951. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EOO

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kathy Matecki". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

KATHY MATECKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600